

REMARKS

The Office Action of October 1, 2007 has been reviewed in detail and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 21, 23, 27, 30, and 44-50 are pending in the application. Claims 21 and 44 are allowed, and claims 23, 27, 30, and 45-50 are rejected. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claims 21 and 44 have been amended, however, no new matter has been introduced into the application, therefore, Claims 21 and 44 remain in condition for allowance.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 23 and 45-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metso et al (US 5,920,826), hereinafter "Metso," in view of Kamada et al. (US 6,192,258), hereinafter "Kamada."

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Metso and Kamada does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a method comprising ... displaying on a user interface a list of contacts stored in a memory of a mobile phone...; receiving a selected contact...; receiving a short cut key activation to compose a text message; displaying a screen to compose a text message upon activation of the short cut key; and if the selected contact includes at least one telephone number ... automatically entering the telephone number into a recipient address field of the displayed compose text message screen," as claimed in Claims 23.

Kamada provides a mobile communication device which has a list of persons with associated phone numbers, fax numbers, and email addresses, and a pen is used to select a phone number, email address, or fax number, and upon making a selection, the associated function is initiated, i.e., making a call, sending an email, or sending a facsimile, respectively. Therefore, the composition of the associated email or facsimile is not initiated prior to selecting the associated address or number from the contact list. Using a pen to select the number or email address does not disclose the claimed "if the selected contact includes at least one telephone number ... automatically entering the telephone number into a recipient address field of the displayed compose text message screen" as suggested by the Examiner.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that nothing in the combination of Metso and Kamada patents, cited in the Office Action discloses at least, “a method comprising ... displaying on a user interface a list of contacts stored in a memory of a mobile phone...; receiving a selected contact...; receiving a short cut key activation to compose a text message; displaying a screen to compose a text message upon activation of the short cut key; and if the selected contact includes at least one telephone number ... automatically entering the telephone number into a recipient address field of the displayed compose text message screen,” as claimed in Claim 23.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Metso and Kamada does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “a mobile phone comprising ... a processor ... configured to: display on the user interface a list of contacts stored in the memory of the mobile phone...; receive a contact selected from the list of contacts...; receive a key activation for the selected contact; display a screen to compose a text message upon activation of the key; and if the selected contact includes at least one telephone number ... automatically enter the telephone number into a recipient address field of the displayed compose text message screen,” as claimed in Claims 45.

Kamada provides a mobile communication device which has a list of persons with associated phone numbers, fax numbers, and email addresses, and a pen is used to select a phone number, email address, or fax number, and upon making a selection, the associated function is initiated, i.e., making a call, sending an email, or sending a facsimile, respectively. Therefore, the composition of the associated email or facsimile is not initiated prior to selecting the associated address or number from the contact list. Using a pen to select the number or email address does not disclose the claimed “if the selected contact includes at least one telephone number ... automatically entering the telephone number into a recipient address field of the displayed compose text message screen” as suggested by the Examiner.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that nothing in the combination of Metso and Kamada patent, cited in the Office Action discloses at least, “a mobile phone comprising ... a processor ... configured to: display on the user interface a list of contacts stored in the memory of the mobile phone...; receive a contact selected from the list of contacts...; receive a key

activation for the selected contact; display a screen to compose a text message upon activation of the key; and if the selected contact includes at least one telephone number ... automatically enter the telephone number into a recipient address field of the displayed compose text message screen,” as claimed in Claim 45.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Metso and Kamada does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, “a method comprising ... displaying on a user interface a list of contacts stored in a memory of a mobile phone...; receiving a contact selected from the list of contacts; receiving an e-mail address of the selected contact...; and ... automatically filling the ... e-mail address ... in a recipient field of an e-mail template displayed on the user interface,” as claimed in Claim 50.

Kamada provides a mobile communication device which has a list of persons with associated phone numbers, fax numbers, and email addresses, and a pen is used to select a phone number, email address, or fax number, and upon making a selection, the associated function is initiated, i.e., making a call, sending an email, or sending a facsimile, respectively. Therefore, the composition of the associated email or facsimile is not initiated prior to selecting the associated address or number from the contact list. Using a pen to select the number or email address does not disclose the claimed “automatically filling the ... e-mail address ... in a recipient field of an e-mail template displayed on the user interface” as suggested by the Examiner.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that nothing in the combination of Metso and Kamada patents, cited in the Office Action discloses at least, “a method comprising ... displaying on a user interface a list of contacts stored in a memory of a mobile phone...; receiving a contact selected from the list of contacts; receiving an e-mail address of the selected contact...; and ... automatically filling the ... e-mail address ... in a recipient field of an e-mail template displayed on the user interface,” as claimed in Claim 50.

With respect to dependent claims 48 and 49, Applicant respectfully submits that each of these claims ultimately depends from independent claim 23 and therefore, claims 48 and 49 are each allowable for at least the same reasons as argued above with respect to independent claim 23.

With respect to dependent claims 46 and 47, Applicant respectfully submits that each of these claims ultimately depend from independent claim 21, which the Examiner has indicated is allowed, and therefore, claims 46 and 47 are each allowable for at least the same reasons with respect to independent claim 21.

Claims 27 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metso in view of Laursen et al. (US 2004/0229595), hereinafter "Laursen."

As an initial matter, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner merely stated that Claims 27 and 30 are unpatentable over Metso in view of Laursen, without indicating specifically or generally where each element of the claims appears in the cited references. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is insufficient, as it does not provide Applicant with the reasoning or basis for the rejection.

Nevertheless, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Metso and Laursen does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a method comprising ... displaying on a user interface a list of contacts stored in a memory of a mobile phone, each contact having at least one URL address field for storing an associated URL address; receiving a selected contact...; receiving a short cut key activation; and connecting to the URL upon receipt of the short cut key activation," as claimed in Claim 27.

Laursen provides a method and apparatus for accessing a database from a mobile device and a computer device. The mobile device can be used in a provisioning process to ensure a secure communication session. A device can be authenticated by sending a request with an identifier. One example is to use a URL as the identifier. The URL is entered in a browser provided and running on the device. Therefore, the URL is not selected in associated with a contact on a contact list, and selection of the URL does not connect to the URL, instead the URL has to be entered into a browser that is already running on the device to be able to send a request. Entering the URL into a browser does not disclose the claimed "receiving a selected contact...; receiving a short cut key activation; and connecting to the URL upon receipt of the short cut key activation," as suggested by the Examiner.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that nothing in the combination of Metso and Laursen references, cited in the Office Action discloses at least, "a method comprising ...

displaying on a user interface a list of contacts stored in a memory of a mobile phone, each contact having at least one URL address field for storing an associated URL address; receiving a selected contact...; receiving a short cut key activation; and connecting to the URL upon receipt of the short cut key activation,” as claimed in Claim 27.

With respect to dependent claim 30, Applicant respectfully submits that this claim ultimately depends from independent claim 27 and therefore, claim 30 is allowable for at least the same reasons as argued above with respect to independent claim 27.

Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned should it be deemed necessary to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: December 27, 2007

By: /William J. Allen/
William J. Allen
Registration No. 51,393
Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.
10 South Wacker Drive
Suite 3000
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001